IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS **CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION**

MICHAEL FAVATA, ET AL,	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs	§	
	§	
V.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:12-CV-00082
	§	
NATIONAL OILWELL VARCO, L.P.,	§	
	§	
aka/fka BRANDT NOV	§	
	§	
Defendant.		

DEFENDANT'S RULE 50 MOTIONS FOR JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW

NOV files the following Rule 50 Motions for Judgment as a Matter of Law:

I. Two-Man Jobs

Pursuant to Rule 50, NOV moves for judgment as a matter of law on Plaintiffs' claim for a half-hour of compensation for time spent in mandatory safety meetings on days in which Plaintiffs recorded 12.0 hours for a two-man jobs because there is no legally sufficient evidentiary basis upon which a reasonable jury could find for the Plaintiffs. The evidence shows that not every rig had a mandatory safety meeting, not every Plaintiff attended safety meetings, and that Plaintiffs often recorded time for safety meetings. Plaintiffs also argued a change in policy but failed to prove or specify when or how the change impacted the claim.

GRAN	NT:	DENY:	
II.	One-Man Jo	hs	

Pursuant to Rule 50, NOV moves for judgment as a matter of law on Plaintiffs' claims for 24 hours of compensation on days in which Plaintiffs recorded 16.0 hours for a one-man job because there is no legally sufficient evidentiary basis upon which a reasonable jury could find for the Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs have admitted that some days where they wrote down 16 hours on their timesheet, they did not actually work 24 hours a day. Further, the evidence shows that Plaintiffs would often sleep at night and not be actually working 24 hours a day.

III. Agreement

Pursuant to Rule 50, NOV moves for judgment as a matter of law on the existence of an
agreement between NOV and the Plaintiffs that governed overtime compensation. There is no
legally sufficient evidentiary basis upon which a reasonable jury could find otherwise, and any
instructions by certain supervisors contrary to the agreement do not negate the existence of an
agreement.
agreement.

agreement.	certain supervisors contrary to the agreement do not negate the existence of an
GRANT:	DENY:
IV. Damage	es -
sufficient evide evidence is lega and whether P admitted that s actually work 2 Therefore, Plain Plaintiffs may h time on their tin Further,	t to Rule 50, NOV moves for judgment as a matter of law that is no legally entiary basis to determine damages for one-man jobs and safety meetings. The ally insufficient to determine which rigs had safety meetings, when they had them laintiffs were allowed that time on their timesheets. Further, Plaintiffs have some days where they wrote down 16 hours on their timesheet, they did not 4 hours (<i>i.e.</i> , when the rig was tripping pipe, stuck in the hole, or running casing) at tiffs have provided legally insufficient evidence for the jury to determine when have been actually working 24 hours day and whether Plaintiffs were allowed that mesheets. Plaintiffs have provided legally insufficient evidence to determine damages fits used the incorrect wage rate in calculating damages.
GRANT:	DENY:
V. Willfuln	ness
practice at issue evidentiary basis	t to Rule 50, NOV moves for judgment as a matter of law that NOV's paye was not a willful violation of the FLSA because there is no legally sufficient is upon which a reasonable jury could find otherwise. Plaintiffs have provided no gest that NOV's actions were deliberate, intentional, and voluntary.
GRANT:	DENY:
VI. DOL W	aiver
all FLSA claim evidentiary bas that shows that	t to Rule 50, NOV moves for judgment as a matter of law that Plaintiffs waived is for the period stated on the Form WH-58 because there is no legally sufficient is upon which a reasonable jury could find otherwise. NOV provided evidence the DOL deemed its investigation a "full investigation" resulting in a waiver of its under the FLSA.

GRANT: _____ DENY: ____

VII. Representative Testimony

Pursuant to Rule 50, NOV moves for judgment as a matter of law that the 7 representative Plaintiffs (Jorge Acosta, Jack Akin, Henry Bolton, Michael Favata, David Kelley, Michael Mallett, and Michael Schwab) are not representative of the other 48 Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs have provided legally insufficient evidence upon which a reasonable jury could find that the 7 representative Plaintiffs are similarly situated to the other 48 Plaintiffs.

have provided legally insufficient evidence upon which a reasonable jury could find that the 7 representative Plaintiffs are similarly situated to the other 48 Plaintiffs.
GRANT: DENY:
VIII. Named Plaintiffs
Pursuant to Rule 50, NOV moves for judgment as a matter of law that Plaintiffs have failed to put on evidence or testimony regarding the following named Plaintiffs: Jerry Jurach, Zach Hunter, and Josue Rameriz. Therefore, there is legally insufficient evidence for a jury to find that these named Plaintiffs have proven their claims.

GRANT: _____ DENY: ____

Dated: April 20, 2014 Respectfully submitted,

/s/ M. Carter Crow
M. Carter Crow

M. Carter Crow State Bar No. 05156500 Federal ID No. 15408

carter.crow@nortonrosefulbright.com

OF COUNSEL FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, L.L.P.

Greg Moore State Bar No. 24055999 Federal ID No. 726516 greg.moore@nortonrosefulbright.com

Rafe A. Schaefer State Bar No. 24077700 Federal ID No. 1743273 rafe.schaefer@nortonrosefulbright.com Fulbright Tower 1301 McKinney, Suite 5100 Houston, Texas 77010-3095 Telephone: (713) 651-5151 Telecopier: (713) 651-5246

Attorney-in-Charge for Defendant National Oilwell Varco aka/ fka Brandt NOV

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served on April 20, 2014, upon the following counsel of record.

Mr. Adam Poncio	Mr. Chris McJunkin
PONCIO LAW OFFICES	2842 Lawnview
5410 Fredericksburg Rd., Suite 109	Corpus Christi, Texas 78404
San Antonio, Texas 78229-3550	_

s/ M. Carter Crow
M. Carter Crow